

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Cambalida coriacea* Simon, 1909 (Arachnida, Araneae) by the suppression of *Castianeira fulvipes* Simon, 1896**

(Case 3331; see BZN 63: 17–19)

Otto Kraus

*Zoologisches Institut & Zoologisches Museum, Martin-Luther-King-Platz 3,  
20146 Hamburg, Germany*

There is no need to conserve the name *Cambalida coriacea* Simon, 1909. Decisive reasons for this view were mentioned in para. 2 of the original application: 'The CORINNIDAE remains one of the most poorly-studied families of spiders . . .'; see also similar remarks in the applicant's para. 4. Since their original introduction and until at least 1995, all names in question were not used again, and afterwards in a very few exceptions: *Castianeira fulvipes* Simon, 1896, *Cambalida coriacea* Simon, 1909 and *Cambalida fulvipes* Simon, 1909. No prevailing usage exists. Hence, stability of practically unused names cannot be threatened. The case should be solved by regular application of the Code. One species should be named *Cambalida fulvipes* (Simon, 1896), with the junior subjective synonym *C. coriacea* Simon, 1909. According to Article 60 of the Code and without any harm, the secondary homonymy in the other species should be solved by replacing *C. fulvipes* Simon, 1909 by a new substitute name.

**Comment on the proposed precedence of the specific name of *Buprestis sexsignata* Say, 1839 (Insecta, Coleoptera) over those of *Chrysobothris ignipes* Gory & Laporte, 1838 and *Chrysobothris germari* Gory & Laporte, 1838**

(Case 3302; see BZN 63: 36–38)

Richard L. Westcott

*Plant Division, Oregon Department of Agriculture, 635 Capitol NE, Salem,  
OR 97301–2532, U.S.A.*

In my opinion there can be no reasonable objection to accepting this proposal. The species is widespread and common in the eastern United States and has been cited many times in the literature. T.C. MacRae provides clear evidence why the Gory & Laporte names should be considered nomina oblita. To resurrect either of them from synonymy, thus making invalid a widely used name, *Chrysobothris sexsignata* (Say), would cause much confusion and work against stability.

Therefore, I urge the acceptance of MacRae's proposal.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific name of *Celaenorrhinus ratna* Fruhstorfer, 1908 (Insecta, Lepidoptera)**

(Case 3339; see BZN 63(2): 114–117)

Rienk de Jong

*Department of Entomology, Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum Naturalis,  
PO Box 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands*

The authors have made a strong case which I fully endorse. In many cases identification is not easy among Asian *Celaenorrhinus* species. With ca. 100 names available it is important that nomenclatural matters do not hamper identification and access to literature. The authors have made a thorough search of the relevant literature, and we can be confident that the name proposed to be suppressed has not ever been used since its introduction in 1907, except for the record mentioned. To further support their claim I like to add that the most complete worldwide catalogue of names in HESPERIIDAE to date, Bridges (1994), a considerably enlarged version of Bridges (1988), incorrectly listed as Bridges (1993, 1998), does not mention Matsumura's name either. The correct references are:

**Bridges, C.A.** 1983. *Lepidoptera: HesperIIDae, Notes on Species-group names*. 274 pp. Bridges, Urbana.

**Bridges, C.A.** 1988. *Catalogue of HesperIIDae (Lepidoptera: Rhopalocera)*. 590 pp. Bridges, Urbana.

**Bridges, C.A.** 1994. *Catalogue of the Family-group, Genus-group and Species-group names of the HesperIIDae (Lepidoptera) of the World*. 644 pp. Bridges, Urbana.

#### **Comment on the proposed conservation of *Palanopus* E. Hitchcock, 1845 (Ichnotaxa, Reptilia?)**

(Case 3348; see BZN 62: 237–239; 63: 49–50, 131–133)

Emma C. Rainforth

*School of Theoretical and Applied Science, Ramapo College of New Jersey,  
505 Ramapo Valley Road, Mahwah NJ 07430, U.S.A. (e-mail:  
erainfor@ramapo.edu)*

1. Moser (see BZN 63: 131–133, para. 1) suggests that *Sauroidichnites* does not need to be suppressed because it is not a valid ichnogenetic name. However, when *Sauroidichnites* was named (Hitchcock, 1837) it was used only at the ichnogenetic level (being used only in binominal combinations with ichnospecies), and not as a supra-ichnogenetic taxon; it was only later used (homonymously) as a supra-ichnogenetic taxon (Hitchcock, 1841). Thus, from its first usage, *Sauroidichnites* is a valid and available ichnogenetic name, and requires either suppression or conservation. If we were to follow Moser's arguments in para. 1, and instead argue that *Sauroidichnites* and the other pre-1845 ichnogeneta were not (or not intended to be) ichnogenetic names (valid and/or available or otherwise), but only supra-ichnogenetic names, then the pre-1845 ichnospecies names would not be valid (validity requiring that the ichnospecific name is associated with an ichnogenetic name, whether that be valid or available or not; Article 11.9.3). In turn, the next valid and available names would be those published (for the most part) in 1845 – which include many objective synonyms of the earlier names. We have then completely destabilized Early Jurassic tetrapod ichnological nomenclature – because, since 1915, all workers in the field have used the older (pre-1845) names. Fortunately, all of the pre-1845 ichnogenetic names (*Ornithichnites*, *Sauroidichnites*, *Batrachoidichnites*, *Tetrapodichnites*) can be shown to have been used in binominal nomenclature (and thus used as ichnogenetic names), and so the species associated with them are valid and available (unless other reasons are present).